

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
<b>ACRONYMS</b>	
<b>1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE ACTION .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	1-1
1.2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	1-2
1.2.1 Alternative Actions Available to the USACE .....	1-2
1.2.2 USACE Considerations in the NEPA and Permit Processes .....	1-3
1.2.3 Definition of Alternatives .....	1-3
1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND .....	1-3
1.3.1 The Port of Houston.....	1-3
1.3.2 The Applicant .....	1-4
1.3.3 The Bayport Channel .....	1-4
1.4 THE APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF NEED FOR ACTION.....	1-5
1.4.1 Summary.....	1-5
1.4.2 Container Terminal Facilities .....	1-5
1.4.3 Cruise Terminal Facilities.....	1-6
1.5 THE USACE DETERMINATION OF PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED PURSUANT TO NEPA AND THE CLEAN WATER ACT .....	1-7
1.5.1 USACE Definition of Project Purpose and Need .....	1-7
1.5.2 USACE Review of the Applicant's Statement of Need .....	1-8
<b>2.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	2-1
2.2 PROCESS TO IDENTIFY REASONABLE AND FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....	2-1
2.2.1 Location, Land Area, and Access Requirements for New Container Terminals .....	2-1
2.2.2 Site Development Requirements for a Container Terminal Facility.....	2-2
2.2.3 Site Identification Process.....	2-2
2.2.3.1 Tier 1 Evaluation to Identify Potential Terminal Location Alternatives .....	2-3
2.2.3.2 Results of the Tier 1 Evaluation Process .....	2-3
2.2.3.3 Tier 2 Evaluation to Identify Potential Terminal Location Alternatives .....	2-4
2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED .....	2-6
2.3.1 Results of the Tier 2 Evaluation Process.....	2-6
2.3.2 Conclusions of the Tier 2 Evaluation Process .....	2-8
2.3.3 The Tier 3 Evaluation Process.....	2-8
2.3.3.1 Sites Large Enough to Individually Provide	

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Adequate Berth Length and Backland Area .....	2-8
2.3.3.2	Sites Not Large Enough to Individually Provide Adequate Berth Length and Backland Area .....	2-11
2.3.3.3	Combinations of Sites .....	2-12
2.3.3.4	Results of the Tier 3 Evaluation Process .....	2-13
2.3.3.5	Conclusions of the Tier 3 Evaluation Process.....	2-13
2.4	ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFIED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS.....	2-15
2.4.1	Elements Common to All Action Alternatives .....	2-15
2.4.2	The No Action Alternative .....	2-15
2.4.3	Bayport Alternative.....	2-16
	2.4.3.1    Container Terminal Complex.....	2-17
	2.4.3.2    Cruise Terminal Complex.....	2-18
	2.4.3.3    Proposed Navigational Improvements and Projected Dredge Volumes .....	2-18
	2.4.3.4    Schedule of Development .....	2-19
2.4.4	Spilmans Island Alternative.....	2-19
2.4.5	Shoal Point Alternative.....	2-20
2.4.6	Cedar Point Alternative .....	2-20
2.4.7	Pelican Island Alternative.....	2-21
2.4.8	Shoal Point/Bayport Alternative .....	2-22
2.4.9	Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Alternative.....	2-22
2.5	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS AND THEIR IMPACTS.....	2-23
2.5.1	Nonenvironmental Considerations .....	2-23
	2.5.1.1    Availability of the Alternative to the Applicant .....	2-23
	2.5.1.2    Operational Effectiveness .....	2-23
	2.5.1.3    Development Constraints .....	2-23
2.5.2	Comparison of Nonenvironmental Considerations .....	2-23
	2.5.2.1    Availability.....	2-24
	2.5.2.2    Operational Effectiveness .....	2-25
	2.5.2.3    Development Constraints .....	2-28
2.5.3	Comparison of Environmental Consequences .....	2-30
	2.5.3.1    Introduction .....	2-30
	2.5.3.2    Land Use and Coastal Zone Management .....	2-30
	2.5.3.3    Socioeconomics .....	2-31
	2.5.3.4    Social Characteristics and Environmental Justice .....	2-31
	2.5.3.5    Surface Transportation .....	2-31
	2.5.3.6    Community Infrastructure and Municipal Services .....	2-32
	2.5.3.7    Navigation.....	2-33
	2.5.3.8    Noise .....	2-33
	2.5.3.9    Aesthetics and Light .....	2-33
	2.5.3.10    Cultural Resources .....	2-34
	2.5.3.11    Parks and Recreation .....	2-34
	2.5.3.12    Air Quality .....	2-34
	2.5.3.13    Public Safety.....	2-35
	2.5.3.14    Hazardous Materials.....	2-35
	2.5.3.15    Shoreline Erosion .....	2-35

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	2.5.3.16 Hydrology, Drainage, and Floodplains .....	2-35
	2.5.3.17 Water Quality.....	2-36
	2.5.3.18 Aquatic Sediments and Dredging .....	2-36
	2.5.3.19 Wetlands.....	2-36
	2.5.3.20 Ecology.....	2-37
<b>3.0</b>	<b>AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....</b>	<b>3.1-1</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION .....	3.1-1
3.2	LAND USE AND COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT .....	3.2-1
3.2.1	Introduction .....	3.2-1
3.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3.2-1
	3.2.2.1 Land Use .....	3.2-1
	3.2.2.2 Coastal Zone Management .....	3.2-4
3.2.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.2-7
	3.2.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.2-7
	3.2.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.2-7
	3.2.3.3 The Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.2-8
	3.2.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.2-9
	3.2.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.2-10
	3.2.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.2-11
	3.2.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.2-12
	3.2.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.2-12
	3.2.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.2-13
	3.2.3.10 Summary .....	3.2-13
3.3	SOCIOECONOMICS .....	3.3-1
3.3.1	Introduction .....	3.3-1
3.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3.3-1
	3.3.2.1 The Three-County Region.....	3.3-4
	3.3.2.2 Chambers County.....	3.3-6
	3.3.2.3 Galveston County .....	3.3-6
	3.3.2.4 Harris County.....	3.3-7
	3.3.2.5 Economic Impacts of the Port of Houston as of 1997 .....	3.3-8
3.3.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.3-13
	3.3.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.3-13
	3.3.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.3-13
	3.3.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.3-15
	3.3.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.3-17
	3.3.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.3-17
	3.3.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.3-18
	3.3.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.3-18
	3.3.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.3-18
	3.3.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.3-19
	3.3.3.10 Summary .....	3.3-19

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.4	SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	3.4-1
3.4.1	Introduction .....	3.4-1
3.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3.4-1
3.4.2.1	Overview.....	3.4-1
3.4.2.1	Bayport Study Area .....	3.4-4
3.4.2.2	Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.4-5
3.4.2.3	Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.4-6
3.4.2.4	Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.4-7
3.4.2.5	Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.4-7
3.4.2.6	Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.4-8
3.4.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.4-8
3.4.3.1	Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.4-8
3.4.3.2	No Action Alternative .....	3.4-9
3.4.3.3	Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.4-12
3.4.3.4	Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.4-13
3.4.3.5	Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.4-14
3.4.3.6	Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.4-14
3.4.3.7	Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.4-15
3.4.3.8	Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.4-16
3.4.3.9	Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.4-17
	Summary .....	3.4-17
3.5	SURFACE TRANSPORTATION .....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Introduction .....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3.5-1
3.5.2.1	Definitions .....	3.5-1
3.5.2.2	Planned and Programmed Roadway Improvements .....	3.5-3
3.5.2.3	Traffic Count Program .....	3.5-3
3.5.2.4	Existing Roadway Network.....	3.5-5
3.5.2.5	Existing Conditions Analysis .....	3.5-9
3.5.2.6	Railroads and Railroad Crossings.....	3.5-10
3.5.2.7	Accident History.....	3.5-10
3.5.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.5-10
3.5.3.1	Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.5-10
3.5.3.2	No Action Alternative .....	3.5-13
3.5.3.3	Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.5-14
3.5.3.4	Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.5-15
3.5.3.5	Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.5-16
3.5.3.6	Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.5-16
3.5.3.7	Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.5-16
3.5.3.8	Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.5-17
3.5.3.9	Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.5-17
3.5.4	Summary.....	3.5-18
	3.5.4.1 Level of Service Comparison Between Alternatives .....	3.5-18
	3.5.4.2 Evaluation of Future-Year Capacity Deficiencies and Required Improvements .....	3.5-18

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	3.5.4.3 Near Site or Site Related Improvements.....	3.5-18
3.6	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES.....	3.6-1
3.6.1	Introduction .....	3.6-1
3.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3.6-1
	3.6.2.1 Bayport Study Area .....	3.6-1
	3.6.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.6-1
	3.6.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.6-1
	3.6.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.6-2
	3.6.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.6-2
	3.6.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.6-2
3.6.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.6-2
	3.6.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.6-2
	3.6.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.6-3
	3.6.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.6-3
	3.6.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.6-3
	3.6.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.6-3
	3.6.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.6-3
	3.6.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.6-4
	3.6.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.6-4
	3.6.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.6-4
	3.6.3.10 Summary .....	3.6-4
3.7	NAVIGATION.....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Introduction .....	3.7-1
3.7.2	Affected Environment.....	3.7-1
	3.7.2.1 Baywide Navigation Activity .....	3.7-1
	3.7.2.2 Bayport Study Area .....	3.7-2
	3.7.2.3 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.7-2
	3.7.2.4 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.7-2
	3.7.2.5 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.7-2
	3.7.2.6 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.7-3
	3.7.2.7 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.7-3
3.7.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.7-3
	3.7.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.7-3
	3.7.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.7-4
	3.7.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.7-5
	3.7.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.7-6
	3.7.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.7-6
	3.7.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.7-7
	3.7.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.7-7
	3.7.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.7-8
	3.7.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.7-9
	3.7.3.10 Summary .....	3.7-10

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.8	NOISE.....	3.8-1
3.8.1	Introduction .....	3.8-1
	3.8.1.1 Fundamentals of Acoustics .....	3.8-1
	3.8.1.2 Regulatory Environment.....	3.8-2
	3.8.1.3 Sound Level Measurements.....	3.8-3
3.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3.8-3
	3.8.2.1 Bayport Study Area .....	3.8-3
	3.8.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.8-5
	3.8.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.8-6
	3.8.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.8-6
	3.8.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.8-7
	3.8.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.8-8
3.8.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.8-8
	3.8.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.8-8
	3.8.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.8-14
	3.8.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.8-14
	3.8.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.8-19
	3.8.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.8-20
	3.8.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.8-21
	3.8.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.8-23
	3.8.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.8-24
	3.8.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.8-27
	3.8.3.10 Summary .....	3.8-29
3.9	AESTHETICS AND LIGHT .....	3.9-1
3.9.1	Introduction .....	3.9-1
3.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3.9-1
	3.9.2.1 Bayport Study Area .....	3.9-2
	3.9.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.9-2
	3.9.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.9-3
	3.9.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.9-4
	3.9.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.9-5
	3.9.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.9-5
3.9.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.9-6
	3.9.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.9-6
	3.9.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.9-6
	3.9.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.9-6
	3.9.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.9-9
	3.9.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.9-10
	3.9.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.9-10
	3.9.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.9-11
	3.9.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.9-11
	3.9.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.9-11
	3.9.3.10 Summary .....	3.9-12

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.10	CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Introduction .....	3.10-1
3.10.2	Affected Environment.....	3.10-1
	3.10.2.1 Bayport Study Area .....	3.10-2
	3.10.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.10-2
	3.10.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.10-3
	3.10.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.10-3
	3.10.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.10-3
	3.10.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.10-4
3.10.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.10-5
	3.10.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.10-5
	3.10.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.10-6
	3.10.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.10-6
	3.10.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.10-7
	3.10.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.10-8
	3.10.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.10-8
	3.10.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.10-9
	3.10.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.10-10
	3.10.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.10-11
	3.10.3.10 Summary .....	3.10-11
3.11	PARKS AND RECREATION .....	3.11-1
3.11.1	Introduction .....	3.11-1
3.11.2	Affected Environment.....	3.11-1
	3.11.2.1 Baywide Recreational Activity .....	3.11-1
	3.11.2.2 Bayport Study Area .....	3.11-2
	3.11.2.3 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.11-3
	3.11.2.4 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.11-3
	3.11.2.5 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.11-3
	3.11.2.6 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.11-3
	3.11.2.7 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.11-3
3.11.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.11-4
	3.11.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.11-4
	3.11.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.11-4
	3.11.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.11-4
	3.11.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.11-5
	3.11.3.10 Summary .....	3.11-6
3.12	AIR QUALITY .....	3.12-1
3.12.1	Introduction .....	3.12-1
3.12.2	Affected Environment.....	3.12-1

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	3.12.2.1      Ambient Air Monitoring .....	3.12-1
	3.12.2.2      Site-Specific Environmental Description .....	3.12-3
3.12.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.12-7
	3.12.3.1      Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.12-7
	3.12.3.2      No Action Alternative .....	3.12-14
	3.12.3.3      Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-15
	3.12.3.4      Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-17
	3.12.3.5      Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-18
	3.12.3.6      Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-19
	3.12.3.7      Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-20
	3.12.3.8      Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.12-21
	3.12.3.9      Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.12-22
	3.12.3.10      Summary .....	3.12-23
3.13	PUBLIC SAFETY.....	3.13-1
3.13.1	Introduction .....	3.13-1
	3.13.1.1      Hazardous Materials Transport .....	3.13-1
	3.13.1.2      Hazardous Material Spills.....	3.13-4
3.13.2	Affected Environment.....	3.13-5
	3.13.2.1      Bayport Study Area .....	3.13-5
	3.13.2.2      Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.13-6
	3.13.2.3      Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.13-7
	3.13.2.4      Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.13-8
	3.13.2.5      Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.13-9
	3.13.2.6      Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.13-10
3.13.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.13-11
	3.13.3.1      Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.13-11
	3.13.3.2      No Action Alternative .....	3.13-12
	3.13.3.3      Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.13-12
	3.13.3.4      Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.13-14
	3.13.3.5      Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.13-14
	3.13.3.6      Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.13-15
	3.13.3.7      Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.13-16
	3.13.3.8      Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.13-17
	3.13.3.9      Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.13-17
	3.13.3.10      Summary .....	3.13-18
3.14	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, HAZARDOUS WASTES, AND OTHER REGULATED SUBSTANCES .....	3.14-1
3.14.1	Introduction .....	3.14-1
	3.14.1.1      Definition of Terms .....	3.14-1
	3.14.1.2      Handling and Transport of Hazardous Materials.....	3.14-2
	3.14.1.3      Generation, Storage, and Disposal of Hazardous Wastes .....	3.14-2
3.14.2	Affected Environment.....	3.14-3
	3.14.2.1      Bayport Study Area .....	3.14-4

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	3.14.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.14-4
	3.14.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.14-4
	3.14.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.14-4
	3.14.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.14-4
	3.14.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.14-5
3.14.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.14-5
	3.14.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.14-5
	3.14.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.14-5
	3.14.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-5
	3.14.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-6
	3.14.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-6
	3.14.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-7
	3.14.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-7
	3.14.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.14-8
	3.14.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.14-8
	3.14.3.10 Mitigation Common to All Alternatives.....	3.14-9
	3.14.3.11 Summary .....	3.14-10
3.15	SHORELINE EROSION .....	3.15-1
3.15.1	Introduction .....	3.15-1
	3.15.1.1 Erosion Processes.....	3.15-1
	3.15.1.2 Applicable Management Programs, Rules, and Regulations.....	3.15-1
3.15.2	Affected Environment.....	3.15-2
	3.15.2.1 Bayport Study Area .....	3.15-3
	3.15.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.15-3
	3.15.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.15-4
	3.15.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.15-4
	3.15.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.15-5
	3.15.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.15-5
3.15.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.15-6
	3.15.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.15-6
	3.15.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.15-7
	3.15.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.15-8
	3.15.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.15-8
	3.15.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.15-9
	3.15.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.15-10
	3.15.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.15-11
	3.15.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative Alternative.....	3.15-12
	3.15.3.10 Summary .....	3.15-13
3.16	HYDROLOGY, DRAINAGE, AND FLOODING .....	3.16-1
3.16.1	Regulatory Framework.....	3.16-1
3.16.2	Affected Environment.....	3.16-4
	3.16.2.1 Climatology.....	3.16-4
	3.16.2.2 Regional Water Bodies.....	3.16-5

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	3.16.2.3 The Galveston Bay Watershed .....	3.16-8
	3.16.2.4 Bayport Study Area .....	3.16-9
	3.16.2.5 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.16-10
	3.16.2.6 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.16-11
	3.16.1.7 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.16-12
	3.16.2.8 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.16-13
	3.16.2.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.16-13
3.16.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.16-14
	3.16.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.16-14
	3.16.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.16-15
	3.16.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.16-15
	3.16.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.16-19
	3.16.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.16-21
	3.16.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.16-22
	3.16.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.16-24
	3.16.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.16-26
	3.16.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.16-27
	3.16.3.10 Summary .....	3.16-29
3.17	WATER QUALITY .....	3.17-1
3.17.1	Introduction and Regulatory Framework.....	3.17-1
	3.17.1.1 Federal Regulations .....	3.17-1
	3.17.1.2 State Regulations .....	3.17-3
3.17.2	Affected Environment.....	3.17-14
	3.17.2.1 Data Collection .....	3.17-14
	3.17.2.2 Regional Surface Water Quality .....	3.17-15
	3.17.2.3 Regional Groundwater Quality .....	3.17-22
	3.17.2.4 Bayport Study Area .....	3.17-23
	3.17.2.5 Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.17-28
	3.17.2.6 Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.17-31
	3.17.2.7 Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.17-34
	3.17.2.8 Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.17-38
	3.17.2.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.17-40
3.17.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.17-43
	3.17.3.1 Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.17-43
	3.17.3.2 No Action Alternative .....	3.17-43
	3.17.3.3 Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.17-44
	3.17.3.4 Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.17-49
	3.17.3.5 Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.17-50
	3.17.3.6 Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.17-51
	3.17.3.7 Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.17-52
	3.17.3.8 Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.17-54
	3.17.3.9 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.17-55
	3.17.3.10 Summary .....	3.17-57

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.18	SEDIMENTS AND DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT .....	3.18-1
3.18.1	Introduction .....	3.18-1
	Galveston Bay National Estuary Program .....	3.18-4
	Sedimentation Rates.....	3.18-5
	Regional Geology .....	3.18-7
	Surficial Soils.....	3.18-8
3.18.2	Affected Environment.....	3.18-9
	3.8.2.1    Bayport Study Area .....	3.18-9
	3.18.2.2    Spilmans Island Study Area .....	3.18-10
	3.18.2.3    Shoal Point Study Area .....	3.18-11
	3.18.2.4    Cedar Point Study Area.....	3.18-12
	3.18.2.5    Pelican Island Study Area .....	3.18-13
	3.18.2.6    Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area.....	3.18-14
3.18.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.18-15
	3.18.3.1    Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.18-15
	3.18.3.2    No Action Alternative .....	3.18-16
	3.18.3.3    Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.18-16
	3.18.3.4    Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.18-18
	3.18.3.5    Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.18-20
	3.18.3.6    Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.18-20
	3.18.3.7    Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.18-21
	3.18.3.8    Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.18-23
	3.18.3.9    Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.18-23
	3.18.3.10    Summary .....	3.18-24
3.19	WETLANDS.....	3.19-1
3.19.1	Regulation of Activities in Wetlands.....	3.19-1
3.19.2	Affected Environment.....	3.19-3
	3.19.2.1    Wetland Indicators.....	3.19-3
	3.19.2.2    National Wetlands Inventory .....	3.19-5
	3.19.2.3    Methods Used to Estimate Wetland Acreage .....	3.19-6
	3.19.2.4    Wetland Estimates.....	3.19-7
3.19.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.19-9
	3.19.3.1    No Action Alternative .....	3.19-9
	3.19.3.2    Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-9
	3.19.3.3    Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-9
	3.19.3.4    Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-10
	3.19.3.5    Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-10
	3.19.3.6    Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-10
	3.19.3.7    Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.19-11
	3.19.3.8    Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.19-11
	3.19.3.9    Proposed and Potential Mitigation Measures.....	3.19-11
	3.19.3.10    Summary .....	3.19-12

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Section</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
3.20	ECOLOGY .....	3.20-1
3.20.1	Regulatory Framework.....	3.20-1
3.20.1.1	Federal Regulations .....	3.20-1
3.20.1.2	State Regulations .....	3.20-7
3.20.2	Affected Environment.....	3.20-7
3.20.2.1	Biotic Communities.....	3.20-7
3.20.2.2	Protected Species .....	3.20-17
3.20.2.3	EFH in Galveston Bay .....	3.20-25
3.20.2.4	Nonindigenous Species.....	3.20-26
3.20.2.5	Specific Conditions at Terminal Location Alternative Study Areas .....	3.20-27
3.20.3	Environmental Consequences .....	3.20-44
3.20.3.1	Assumptions and Methodologies .....	3.20-44
3.20.3.2	No Action Alternative .....	3.20-45
3.20.3.3	Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-46
3.20.3.4	Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-51
3.20.3.5	Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-55
3.20.3.6	Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-59
3.20.3.7	Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-63
3.20.3.8	Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative .....	3.20-67
3.20.3.9	Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative.....	3.20-68
3.20.3.10	Proposed and Potential Mitigation Measures.....	3.20-71
3.20.3.11	Summary .....	3.20-79
4.0	UNAVOIDABLE, LONG-TERM, AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....	4-1
4.1	INTRODUCTION .....	4-1
4.2	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT .....	4-1
4.3	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES FROM THE PROPOSED PROJECT.....	4-3
4.4	RELATIONSHIP OF SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY .....	4-3
4.5	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....	4-4
4.5.1	Potential Cumulative Effects Issues Addressed in this EIS .....	4-5
4.5.2	Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology.....	4-6
4.5.2	Geographic Boundaries and Time Frames.....	4-6
4.5.3	Magnitude and Significance of Cumulative Effects.....	4-6
4.5.4	Identification of Present and Future Actions .....	4-7
4.5.5	Results of Cumulative Effects Assessment .....	4-9
4.5.5.1	Introduction .....	4-9
4.5.5.2	Land Use and Coastal Zone Management .....	4-10
4.5.5.3	Socioeconomic Environment .....	4-10

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
4.5.5.4	Social Characteristics and Environmental Justice .....	4-11
4.5.5.5	Surface Transportation .....	4-13
4.5.5.6	Community Infrastructure and Municipal Services .....	4-14
4.5.5.7	Navigation.....	4-14
4.5.5.8	Noise .....	4-15
4.5.5.9	Aesthetics and Light .....	4-15
4.5.5.10	Cultural Resources .....	4-15
4.5.5.11	Parks and Recreation .....	4-16
4.5.5.12	Air Quality .....	4-16
4.5.5.13	Public Safety.....	4-19
4.5.5.14	Hazardous Materials.....	4-19
4.5.5.15	Shoreline Erosion .....	4-19
4.5.5.16	Hydrology, Drainage, and Floodplains .....	4-20
4.5.5.17	Water Quality.....	4-20
4.5.5.18	Sediments and Dredged Material Placement.....	4-24
4.5.5.19	Wetlands.....	4-25
4.5.5.20	Ecology.....	4-27
4.6	COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....	4-28
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	INTRODUCTION .....	5-1
5.2	SCOPING .....	5-1
5.2.1	Scoping Process .....	5-1
5.2.2	Issues Raised During the Scoping Process.....	5-2
5.3	COMMUNITY OUTREACH .....	5-4
5.3.1	Meetings.....	5-4
5.3.2	Newsletters .....	5-7
5.4	PUBLIC HEARING .....	5-7
5.5	RECIPIENTS .....	5-7
<b>6.0</b>	<b>LIST OF PREPARERS .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>INDEX.....</b>	<b>8-1</b>

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| E-1    | Tier 2 Evaluation of Potential Terminal Location Alternatives  |
| E-2    | Tier 3 Evaluation of Terminal Location Alternatives  |
| E-3    | Acreage of Dredge and Fill   |
| E-4    | Summary Comparison of Land Availability, Operational Effectiveness, and Site Constraints   |
| E-5    | Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences   |
| 2-1    | Tier 2 Evaluation of Potential Terminal Location Alternatives  |
| 2-2    | Tier 3 Evaluation of Terminal Location Alternatives  |
| 2-3    | Acreage of Dredge and Fill   |
| 2-4    | Summary Comparison of Land Availability, Operational Effectiveness, and Site Constraints   |
| 2-5    | Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences   |
| 3.2-1  | Summary of Land Use Definitions and Categories   |
| 3.2-2  | Adverse Effect Potential to Coastal Natural Resource Areas, By Location  |
| 3.3-1  | Wage and Salary Employment and Population for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2000  |
| 3.3-2  | Employment by Major Economic Sectors for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2000   |
| 3.3-3  | Location Quotients for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region, Comparison with the State of Texas, 1987 and 1997   |
| 3.3-4  | Location Quotients for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region, Comparison with the Southwest Region, 1987 and 1997 |
| 3.3-5  | Wage and Salary Employment and Population for Chambers County, 1980 to 2000  |
| 3.3-6  | Employment by Major Economic Sectors for Chambers County, 1980 to 2000   |
| 3.3-7  | Top Twenty Major Employers in Chambers County, July 1999   |
| 3.3-8  | 1997 Average Wage by Economic Sector for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties  |
| 3.3-9  | Chambers County Civilian Labor Force Annual Average Estimates and Unemployment Rates, 1990 to 1999   |
| 3.3-10 | Civilian Labor Force Characteristics for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties by Race and Sex, July 1999                                     |
| 3.3-11 | Wage and Salary Employment and Population for Galveston County, 1980 to 2000   |
| 3.3-12 | Employment by Major Economic Sectors for Galveston County, 1980 to 2000  |
| 3.3-13 | Major Employers in Galveston County, 2000  |

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.3-14 Galveston County Civilian labor Force Annual Average Estimates and Unemployment Rates, 1990 to 1999
- 3.3-15 Wage and Salary Employment and Population for Harris County, 1980 to 2000
- 3.3-16 Employment by Major Economic Sectors for Harris County, 1980 to 2000
- 3.3-17 Major Employers in Harris County, 1999
- 3.3-18 Harris County Civilian Labor Force Annual Average Estimates and Unemployment Rates, 1990 to 1999
- 3.3-19 Summary of the Economic Impacts Generated by the Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-20 Direct Jobs by Category Generated by Cargo at Applicant-Owned and Private Marie Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-21 Summary of Impacts Generated by the Applicant-Owned Marine Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-22 Commodity Tonnage for the Applicant-Owned Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-23 Applicant's Barbour Cut Cruise Operations Sailings and Passengers, 1997 to 1999
- 3.3-24 The No Action Alternative Economic Impact Projections of Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Cargo Operations, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-25 Summary of the No Action Alternative Economic Impact Projections of Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminal Operations, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-26 Summary of the No Action Alternative Economic Impact Projections of Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminal Operations, 2030
- 3.3-27 Distribution of Marine Cargo Direct Jobs for the No Action Alternative, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-28 The No Action Alternative Economic Impact Projections of Applicant's Barbours Cut Cruise Operations, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-29 The Terminal Location Alternatives Economic Impact Projections for the Applicant-Owned and Private Terminal Cargo Operations, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-30 Summary of the Terminal Location Alternatives Economic Impact Projections of Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminal Operations, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-31 Summary of the Terminal Location Alternatives Economic Impact Projections for the Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminal Operations, 2030
- 3.3-32 Comparison of Total Employment Impacts for the No Action Alternative and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-33 Distribution of Marine Cargo Direct Jobs for the Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.3-34 The Terminal Location Alternatives Economic Impact Projections of Applicant's Barbours Cut Cruise Operations, 2005 to 2030
- 3.3-35 Projected Economic Impacts Resulting from the Construction of the Terminal Development and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2023

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.3-36 Geographic Distribution of the Total Net Employment Increase Attributed to the Terminal Development and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2030
- 3.4-1 EPA Region 6 Potential Environmental Justice Index for the Study Areas and Areas Within 1 to 50 Square Miles of the Terminal Development and Terminal Development Alternatives
- 3.4-2 Population Growth Trends for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2000
- 3.4-3 1990 United States Census Population and Estimated Population for 1995 and 2000 By Race and Ethnicity for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region
- 3.4-4 1990 Racial Characteristics of Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region
- 3.4-5 1990 Income Distribution for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region
- 3.4-6 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and the Three-County Region
- 3.4-7 1990 and 1999 Population Estimates for Study Areas and City and Towns
- 3.4-8 Bayport Study Area 1990 Racial and Ethnic Composition
- 3.4-9 Bayport Study Area 1990 Income Distribution
- 3.4-10 Bayport Study Area 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics
- 3.4-11 Spilmans Island Study Area 1990 Racial and Ethnic Composition
- 3.4-12 Spilmans Island Study Area 1990 Income Distribution
- 3.4-13 Spilmans Island Study Area 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics
- 3.4-14 Shoal Point Study Area 1990 Racial Composition
- 3.4-15 Shoal Point Study Area 1990 Income Distribution
- 3.4-16 Shoal Point Study Area 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics
- 3.4-17 Cedar Point Study Area 1990 Race Composition
- 3.4-18 Cedar Point Study Area 1990 Income Distribution
- 3.4-19 Cedar Point Study 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics
- 3.4-20 1990 Census Racial and Ethnic Characteristics for the Texas A&M University at Galveston Dormitories
- 3.4-21 Racial and Ethnic Characteristics of Student Enrollment at Texas A&M University at Galveston, Fall 1999 and Spring 2000
- 3.4-22 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area 1990 Racial Composition
- 3.4-23 Upper San Jacinto Bay Community Impact Area 1990 Income Distribution
- 3.4-24 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area 1990 Employment and Journey to Work Characteristics

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.4-25 No Action Alternative Population, Persons per Household, and Employment Projections for Chambers, Galveston, Harris, and the Three-County Region, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-26 No Action Alternative Population Projections by Race and Ethnicity for the Three-County Region, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-27 Population and Employment Projections for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-28 Employment Estimates and Projection By Major Economic Sectors for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-29 Population Projections by Race and Ethnicity for Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-30 Population and Employment Projection for Chambers County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-31 Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Economic Sectors for Chambers County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-32 Population and Employment Projection for Galveston County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-33 Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Economic Sectors for Galveston County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-34 Population and Employment Projection for Harris County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-35 Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Economic Sectors for Harris County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-36 Geographic Distribution of the Total Port-Related Net Employment Attributed to the Terminal Development and Other Terminal Location Alternatives Located in Harris County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-37 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth By County for the Terminal Development and Harris County Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-38 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth for the Three-County Region for the Terminal Development and Harris County Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-39 Estimated Relocations and Property Acquisitions Resulting From the Terminal Location Alternatives
- 3.4-40 Evaluation of Factors for Potential to Produce Environmental Justice Impacts
- 3.4-41 Geographic Distribution of the Total Port-Related Net Employment Attributed to the Shoal Point and Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternatives Located in Galveston County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-42 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth by County for the Shoal Point and Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternatives Located in Galveston County, 2000 to 2030

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.4-43 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth for the Three-County Region for the Shoal Point and Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternatives Located in Galveston County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-44 Geographic Distribution of the Total Port-Related Net Employment Increase Attributed to the Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative Located in Chambers County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-45 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth by the County for the Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative Located in Chambers County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-46 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth for the Three-County Region for the Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative Located in Chambers County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-47 Geographic Distribution of the Total Port-Related Net Employment Increase Attributed to the Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative Located in Harris and Galveston Counties, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-48 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth By County for the Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative Located in Harris and Galveston Counties, 2000 to 2030
- 3.4-49 Geographic Distribution of Employment and Population Growth for the Three-County Region for the Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative Located in Harris and Galveston Counties, 2000 to 2030
- 3.5-1 Existing Roadways Level of Service Summary
- 3.5-2 Existing At-Grade Railroad Crossing Data
- 3.5-3 Accident Summary – Three-Year Period from 1996 to 1998
- 3.5-4 Traffic Count Summary (Barbours Cut Boulevard and North Broadway Street)
- 3.5-5 Daily Unit Throughput – June 2000
- 3.5-6 Existing Terminals Trip Generation – Calculation and Calibration Methodology
- 3.5-7 Container Terminal Traffic
- 3.5-8 Main Origins of Containerized Cargo Traveling to Barbours Cut Terminal
- 3.5-10 Year 2005 Level of Service Summary No Action Alternative
- 3.5-11 Year 2015 Level of Service Summary No Action Alternative
- 3.5-12 Year 2025 Level of Service Summary No Action Alternative
- 3.5-13 Year 2005 Level of Service Summary Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-14 Year 2015 Level of Service Summary Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-15 Year 2025 Level of Service Summary Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-16 Year 2005 Level of Service Summary Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-17 Year 2015 Level of Service Summary Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.5-18 Year 2025 Level of Service Summary Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-19 Year 2005 Level of Service Summary Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-20 Year 2015 Level of Service Summary Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-21 Year 2025 Level of Service Summary Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-22 Year 2005 Level of Service Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-23 Year 2015 Level of Service Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-24 Year 2025 Level of Service Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-25 Year 2005 Level of Service Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-26 Year 2015 Level of Service Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-27 Year 2025 Level of Service Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-28 Year 2005 Level of Service Bayport/Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-29 Year 2015 Level of Service Bayport/Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-30 Year 2025 Level of Service Bayport/Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-31 Year 2005 Level of Service Bayport/Upper San Jacinto Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-32 Year 2015 Level of Service Bayport/Upper San Jacinto Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-33 Year 2025 Level of Service Bayport/Upper San Jacinto Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-34 2005 Level of Service Comparison All Terminal Location Alternatives
- 3.5-35 2015 Level of Service Comparison All Terminal Location Alternatives
- 3.5-36 2025 Level of Service Comparison All Terminal Location Alternatives
- 3.5-37 Comparative Total of Lane Miles Required per Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.5-38 Year 2025 Required Roadway Improvements All Terminal Location Alternatives
- 3.5-39 Planned Roadway Improvement Projects in Study Area
- 3.7-1 Ship and Tow Transits in the Study Areas
- 3.7-2 Commercial Fishing Permits Issued for the Galveston Bay Area
- 3.7-3 Recreational Marina Survey Results
- 3.7-4 Number of Recreational Boat Permits Registered in the Three County Region
- 3.7-5 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the No Action Alternative
- 3.7-6 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-7 Sailing Distance from Galveston Sea Buoy to Turning Basins at Each Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-8 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-9 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.7-10 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-11 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-12 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for the Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-13 Projected Average Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits for Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.7-14 Projected One-Way Transits for Container Ships, Cruise Ships, Other Ships, and Tows fro Each Terminal Location Alternative for Year 2030
- 3.8-1 Sound Levels of Typical Noise Sources and Environments (A-Weighted Sound Levels)
- 3.8-2 Ambient Noise Levels Bayport Terminal Location Alternative – Shoreacres
- 3.8-3 Ambient Noise Levels Bayport Terminal Location Alternative – El Jardin
- 3.8-4 Ambient Noise Levels Bayport Terminal Location Alternative – Surf Oaks
- 3.8-5 Ambient Noise Levels Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-6 Ambient Noise Levels Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-7 Ambient Noise Levels Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-8 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring March 28 to 29, 2000 (P1)
- 3.8-9 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring March 29 to 30, 2000 (P2)
- 3.8-10 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring March 30 to 31, 2000 (P3)
- 3.8-11 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring May 31 to June 1, 2000 (P4)
- 3.8-12 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring June 1 to June 2, 2000 (P5)
- 3.8-13 Barbours Cut Terminal Noise Monitoring October 10, 2001 (P6)
- 3.8-14 Acoustical Calculations for Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-15 Calculated Sound Levels
- 3.8-16 Acoustical Calculations for Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-17 Acoustical Calculations for Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-18 Acoustical Calculations for Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-19 Acoustical Calculations for Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-20 Acoustical Calculations for Shoal Point/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.8-21 Acoustical Calculations for Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-1 Cultural Resources, No Action Alternative
- 3.10-2 Cultural Resources, Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-3 Cultural Resources, Spilmans Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-4 Cultural Resources, Shoal Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-5 Cultural Resources, Cedar Point Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-6 Cultural Resources, Pelican Island Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.10-7 Cultural Resources, Upper San Jacinto Bay Terminal Location Alternative

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.11-1 Parks and Open Space Classification Table
- 3.11-2 Galveston Bay Recreational Usage
- 3.11-3 Gulf Coast Region Activities Summary
- 3.11-4 Recreational Properties in the Study Areas
- 3.12-1 National and Texas Ambient Air Quality Standards
- 3.12-2 Criteria Pollutants: Maximum Values (By Monitoring Site and Year)
- 3.12-3 Container and Cruise Terminal Construction Emissions Sources
- 3.12-4 Container Terminal Operational Emission Sources
- 3.12-5 Cruise Terminal Operational Emission Sources
- 3.12-6 No Action Alternative Total Air Quality Emissions
- 3.12-7 Bayport Related Emissions
- 3.12-8 Bayport Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-9 Bayport Emissions Inventory Comparison To Bayport SIP Budget For NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-10 Bayport Emissions Inventory Comparison To Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-11 Bayport Conformity-Related Emissions (NO<sub>x</sub>)
- 3.12-12 Bayport Estimated CO Ground Level Ambient Concentrations
- 3.12-13 Ratio of Terminal Location Alternatives Site Activity to Bayport Terminal Location Alternative
- 3.12-14 Spilmans Island Related Emissions
- 3.12-15 Spilmans Island Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-16 Spilmans Island Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-17 Spilmans Island Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-18 Shoal Point Related Emissions
- 3.12-19 Shoal Point Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-20 Shoal Point Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-21 Shoal Point Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-22 Cedar Point Related Emissions
- 3.12-23 Cedar Point Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-24 Cedar Point Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-25 Cedar Point Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-26 Pelican Island Related Emissions
- 3.12-27 Pelican Island Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-28 Pelican Island Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-29 Pelican Island Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-30 Shoal Point/Bayport Related Emissions
- 3.12-31 Shoal Point/Bayport Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions
- 3.12-32 Shoal Point/Bayport Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for NO<sub>x</sub>
- 3.12-33 Shoal Point/Bayport Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget for VOC
- 3.12-34 Upper San Jacinto Bay Related Emissions
- 3.12-35 Upper San Jacinto Bay Related Offsite and Onsite Emissions

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- 3.12-36 Upper San Jacinto Bay Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget
- 3.12-37 Upper San Jacinto Bay Emissions Inventory Comparison to Bayport SIP Budget
- 3.13-1 Public Safety Services Available in the Study Area
- 3.13-2 Surface Transportation Related Releases for Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties During the Period of January 1, 1998 to December 31, 1999
- 3.13-3 Projected Dwelling Units by County as an Indicator of the Need for Fire Protection Services for the No Action and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.13-4 Projected Number of Additional Law Enforcement Officers Needed to Accommodate Population Growth for the No Action and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2000 to 2030
- 3.13-5 No Action Population and the Projected Number of Additional Ambulances needed As the Result of the Induced Population for the No Action and Terminal Location Alternatives by County, 2000 to 2030
- 3.14-1 Terms and Definitions Connected with the Use and Transport of Hazardous Materials, Hazardous Wastes, and Other Regulated Substances
- 3.14-2 PHA Barbours Cut Terminal 1999 Hazardous Materials Inventory
- 3.14-3 Port Facilities Involved in the Use and Storage of Hazardous Materials and Other Regulated Substances
- 3.15-1 Bayport Study Area
- 3.15-2 Spilmans Island Study Area
- 3.15-3 Shoal Point Study Area
- 3.15-4 Cedar Point Study Area
- 3.15-5 Pelican Island Study Area
- 3.15-6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area
- 3.16-1 FEMA Floodplain Map Designations
- 3.16-2 Key HCFCD Design Criteria
- 3.16-3 Key Drainage Requirements for the City of Galveston
- 3.16-4 Tropical Storm Events that have Impacted Galveston Bay Since 1900
- 3.16-5 Average Tidal Extremes
- 3.16-6 Selected Tidal Prisms in Galveston Bay
- 3.16-7 Galveston Bay Sub Watersheds
- 3.16-8 Land Use and Soil Types in Galveston Bay Sub-Watersheds
- 3.17-1 TNRCC Water Quality Criteria and Uses in the Galveston Bay Estuaries
- 3.17-2 1999 303(D) List: Guidance for Assigning Priority for TMDL Development
- 3.17-3 Aquatic Life Protection Criteria in Water for Specific Toxic Materials
- 3.17-4 Aquatic Life Subcategories
- 3.17-5 Average Annual Point- and Nonpoint-Source Loads for Galveston Bay
- 3.17-6 Variation of Temperature, DO, pH, and Salinity with Depth in Bayport Ship Channel

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF TABLES**

**Table**

- |        |   |
|--------|---|
| 3.17-7 | Water Quality Data for the Applicant's Barbours Cut Facility  |
| 3.17-8 | Estimated Average Loads in Stormwater Runoff  |
| 3.18-1 | Sediment Quality Data   |
| 3.18-2 | Historical Dredge Volumes   |
| 3.18-3 | Estimated Dredge Volumes and Available Capacity   |
| 3.18-4 | Grain Size Analysis for Proposed Site and Alternatives  |
| 3.18-5 | Elutriate Data  |
| 3.18-6 | Analysis of Disposal Alternatives   |
| 3.18-7 | Estimated Dredging Volumes for Terminal Complex   |
| 3.19-1 | National Wetlands Inventory – Wetlands Mapped on Each Site (in acres)   |
| 3.19-2 | Wetlands on Each Site Mapped From Aerial Photographic Study (in acres)  |
| 3.20-1 | State and Federal Listed Species Potentially Occurring within the Study Area  |
| 3.20-2 | Dominant Upland Plant Communities Mapped in the Study Areas (in acres)  |
| 3.20-3 | Reptiles and Amphibians Potentially Occurring in the Study Areas  |
| 3.20-4 | Bird Species Potentially Occurring in the Study Areas   |
| 3.20-5 | Mammals Potentially Occurring in the Study Areas  |
| 3.20-6 | An Abbreviated Checklist of Fish Species Potentially Occurring in Galveston Bay   |
| 4-1    | Year 2005 Level of Service Summary, Cumulative Scenario<br>(Bayport Plus Texas City)  |
| 4-2    | Year 2015 Level of Service Summary, Cumulative Scenario<br>(Bayport Plus Texas City)  |
| 4-3    | Year 2025 Level of Service Summary, Cumulative Scenario (Bayport Plus Texas City)   |
| 4-4    | Approved USACE Permit Applications, 1995 – 2000   |
| 4-5    | Other Activities Existing and Proposed That May Cumulatively Affect Resources of Concern Associated with the Applicant's Proposed Project |
| 4-6    | Potential Cumulative Effects Associated with Key Scoping Issues   |

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- E-1 Proposed Project
- E-2 Port of Houston Area
- E-3 Possible Terminal Sites From Tier 1 Analysis
- E-4 Terminal Location Alternatives
- E-5 Alternative Development Location Bayport
- E-6 Alternative Development Location Spilmans Island
- E-7 Alternative Development Location Shoal Point
- E-8 Alternative Development Location Cedar Point
- E-9 Alternative Development Location Pelican Island
- E-10 Partial Build Development Location Shoal Point
- E-11 Partial Build Development Location Bayport
- E-12 Alternative Development Location Upper San Jacinto Bay
  
- 1-1 Proposed Project
- 1-2 Port of Houston Area
  
- 2-1 Possible Terminal Sites From Tier 1 Analysis
- 2-2 Terminal Location Alternatives
- 2-3 Proposed Project
- 2-4 Alternative Development Location Spilmans Island
- 2-5 Alternative Development Location Shoal Point
- 2-6 Alternative Development Location Cedar Point
- 2-7 Alternative Development Location Pelican Island
- 2-8 Partial Build Development Location Shoal Point
- 2-9 Partial Build Development Location Bayport
- 2-10 Alternative Development Location Upper San Jacinto Bay
  
- 3.2.1 Bayport Study Area
- 3.2.2 Spilmans Island Study Area
- 3.2.3 Shoal Point Study Area
- 3.2.4 Cedar Point Study Area
- 3.2.5 Pelican Island Study Area
- 3.2.6 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area
- 3.2.7 Coastal Zone Boundary
- 3.3.1 Comparison of Employment Growth by Major Economic Sectors for the Three-County Region, 1980 and 2000
- 3.3.2 Employment Distribution and Growth for Chambers County, 1980 to 1997
- 3.3.3 Comparison of Employment by Major Economic Sectors for Chambers County, 1980 and 2000
- 3.3.4 Employment Distribution and Growth for Galveston County, 1980 to 1997

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- 3.3-5 Employment Distribution by Major Economic Sectors for Galveston County, 1980 and 2000
- 3.3-6 Employment Distribution and Growth for Harris county, 1980 to 1997
- 3.3-7 Comparison of Employment Growth by Major Economic Sectors for Harris County, 1980 and 2000
- 3.3-8 Percent Distribution of Direct Jobs by Economic Sector for the Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-9 Distribution of Direct Jobs by Economic Sector for Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-10 Distribution of Direct Jobs by Commodity for Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-11 Distribution of Total Direct Jobs for Applicant-Owned and Private Marine Terminals by Place of Residence, 1997
- 3.3-12 Percent Distribution of the Commodity Tonnage for the Applicant-Owned Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-13 Distribution of Direct Jobs by Economic Sector for Applicant-Owned Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-14 Distribution of Applicant Direct Jobs by Commodity Group, 1997
- 3.3-15 Distribution of Business Revenue Generated by Applicant-Owned Terminals, 1997
- 3.3-16 Distribution of Marine Cargo Direct Jobs by Economic Sector for the No Action Alternative, 2030
- 3.3-17 Comparison of the Employment Impacts of the No Action and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2030
- 3.3-18 Distribution of Marine Cargo Direct Jobs by Economic Sector for the Terminal Development and Terminal Location Alternatives, 2030
- 3.4-1 Community Study Areas, Bayport
- 3.4-2 Population Estimates and Projections for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-3 Projected Racial and Ethnic Composition of the Three-County Region, 2000, 2015, and 2030
- 3.4-4 Wage and Salary Employment Estimates and Projections for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-5 Wage and Salary Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Sector for the Three-County Region, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-6 Projected Racial and Ethnic Composition of Chambers County, 2000, 2015, and 2030
- 3.4-7 Wage and Salary Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Sector for Chambers County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-8 Projected Racial and Ethnic Composition of Galveston County, 2000, 2015, and 2030

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- 3.4-9 Wage and Salary Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Sector for Galveston County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.4-10 Projected Racial and Ethnic Composition of Harris County, 2000, 2015, and 2030
- 3.4-11 Wage and Salary Employment Estimates and Projections By Major Sector for Harris County, 1980 to 2030
- 3.5-1 Traffic Analysis Locations Bayport Study Area
- 3.5-2 Traffic Analysis Locations Spilmans Island and Upper San Jacinto Study Areas
- 3.5-3 Traffic Analysis Locations Cedar Point Study Area
- 3.5-4 Traffic Analysis Locations Shoal Point Study Area
- 3.5-5 Traffic Analysis Locations Pelican Island Study Area
- 3.5-6 Railroad System
- 3.5-7 Barbours Cut Boulevard Traffic Count Program
- 3.5-8 Barbours Cut Original Survey Distribution
- 3.5-9 Locations of Drayed Traffic
- 3.5-10 2005 No Action Alternative ADT
- 3.5-11 2025 No Action Alternative ADT
- 3.5-12 2005 No Action Alternative
- 3.5-13 2025 No Action Alternative
- 3.5-14 Bayport Transportation Impact Analysis
- 3.5-15 Spilmans Island Transportation Impact Analysis
- 3.5-16 Shoal Point Transportation Impact Analysis
- 3.5-17 Cedar Point Transportation Impact Analysis
- 3.5-18 Pelican Island Transportation Impact Statement
- 3.5-19 Shoal Point/Bayport Transportation Impact Study Area
- 3.5-20 Upper San Jacinto Bay/Bayport Alternative Transportation Impact Study Area
- 3.7-1 USCG Transit Checkpoints
- 3.7-2 Projected Total Weekly Vessel One-Way Transits
- 3.8-1 Noise Monitoring Sites Bayport Study Area
- 3.8-2 Noise Monitoring Sites Spilmans Island Study Area
- 3.8-3 Noise Monitoring Sites Shoal Point Study Area
- 3.8-4 Noise Monitoring Sites Cedar Point Study Area
- 3.8-5 Noise Monitoring Sites Pelican Island Study Area
- 3.8-6 Noise Monitoring Sites Barbours Cut Study Area
- 3.8-7 Barbours Cut Terminal Additional Noise Monitoring Sites
- 3.8-8 Typical Construction Equipment Noise Generation Levels
- 3.9-1 Overview Map of Photo Locations Northern Sites
- 3.9-2 Overview Map of Photo Locations Southern Sites
- 3.9-3 View of the Bayport Site From the Bay Colony Subdivision, Looking South
- 3.9-4 View of the Bayport Site From Offshore Seabrook Point, Looking West

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- 3.9-5 View of the Bayport Site From Park Drive and Cedar Street and El Jardin, Looking Northeast
- 3.9-6 View of Spilmans Island Site From Fred Hartman Bridge, Looking South
- 3.9-7 View of Spilmans Island From EGP Fuels, Looking East
- 3.9-8 View of Shoal Point From Texas City Dike Road, Looking South
- 3.9-9 View of Shoal Point From Texas City Channel, Looking East
- 3.9-10 View of Cedar Point Site from Offshore, Looking Northwest
- 3.9-11 View of Cedar Point Site from Offshore, Looking Northeast
- 3.9-12 View of Pelican Island Site From Elevated Texas A&M University at Galveston Dormitories, Looking North
- 3.9-13 View of Pelican Island Site From the Harbor Village Subdivision, Looking Northwest
- 3.9-14 Obstructed View From San Jacinto Park Road 1836, Looking South
- 3.9-15 View of Upper San Jacinto Bay Site From Offshore, Looking West
- 3.9-16 View of Upper San Jacinto Site From Miller Cutoff Road, Looking East
- 3.9-17 Artists Rendering of the Proposed Project From an Aerial View, Looking Southwest
- 3.9-18 View of PHA Barbours Cut Terminal From Spilmans Island, Looking South
- 3.9-19 View of PHA Barbours Cut Terminal From Galveston Bay, Looking West
- 3.9-20 Cross Section Locations for Conceptual Line of Sight Drawings – Bayport Alternative
- 3.9-21 Conceptual Line of Sight Drawings for the Bayport Alternative
- 3.10-1 Cultural Resources Alternative: Bayport
- 3.10-2 Cultural Resources Alternative: Spilmans Island
- 3.10-3 Cultural Resources Alternative: Shoal Point
- 3.10-4 Cultural Resources Alternative: Cedar Point
- 3.10-5 Cultural Resources Alternative: Pelican Island
- 3.10-6 Cultural Resources Alternative: Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.11-1 Recreational Properties in the Study Area, 1 of 2
- 3.11-2 Recreational Properties in the Study Area, 2 of 2
- 3.12-1 Criteria Pollutant Monitoring Stations
- 3.15-1 Bayport Study Area
- 3.15-2 Spilmans Island Study Area
- 3.15-3 Shoal Point Study Area
- 3.15-4 Cedar Point Study Area
- 3.15-5 Upper San Jacinto Bay Study Area
- 3.16-1 Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment; and Water Quality Stations: Bayport
- 3.16-2 FEMA Floodplain Data: Bayport
- 3.16-3 Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment, and Water Quality Stations: Spilmans Island

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- 3.16-4           FEMA Floodplain Data: Spilmans Island
- 3.16-5           Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment, and Water Quality Stations:  
Shoal Point
- 3.16-6           FEMA Floodplain Data: Shoal Point
- 3.16-7           Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment, and Water Quality Stations:  
Cedar Point
- 3.16-8           FEMA Floodplain Data: Cedar Point
- 3.16-9           Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment, and Water Quality Stations:  
Pelican Island
- 3.16-10          FEMA Floodplain Data: Pelican Island
- 3.16-11          Drainage Patterns, Well Locations, Sediment, and Water Quality Stations:  
Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.16-12          FEMA Floodplain Data: Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.18-1           Proposed Offsite Dredged Material Placement Areas
- 3.19-1           National Wetlands Inventory Bayport
- 3.19-2           National Wetlands Inventory Spilmans Island
- 3.19-3           National Wetlands Inventory Shoal Point
- 3.19-4           National Wetlands Inventory Cedar Point
- 3.19-5           National Wetlands Inventory Pelican Island
- 3.19-6           National Wetlands Inventory Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.19-7           Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Bayport
- 3.19-8           Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Spilmans Island
- 3.19-9           Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Shoal Point
- 3.19-10          Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Cedar Point
- 3.19-11          Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Pelican Island
- 3.19-12          Aerial Image Illustrating Wetland Areas: Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.20-1           Upland Habitats: Bayport
- 3.20-2           Upland Habitats: Spilmans Island
- 3.20-3           Upland Habitats: Shoal Point
- 3.20-4           Upland Habitats: Cedar Point
- 3.20-5           Upland Habitats: Pelican Island
- 3.20-6           Upland Habitats: Upper San Jacinto Bay
- 3.20-7           Oyster Reefs in Galveston Bay
- 4-1              Location of Past, Present and Future Actions in the Project Region
- 4-2              Location of Past, Present and Future Actions in the Immediate Project Area
- 4-3              HGA Population Growth versus the Annual Maximum Number of Ozone  
Exceedance Days at a Single Monitoring Site – 1980 through 1997
- 4-4              Number of Exceedance Days Versus Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for  
Harris County
- 4-5              Galveston Bay Watershed

**PROPOSED BAYPORT TERMINAL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure**

- 4-6 Time Trend of Dissolved Oxygen Deficit in Upper Houston Ship Channel
- 4-7 Cumulative Dredged Volume (New Work) in Galveston Bay Navigation Channels
- 4-8 Net Losses and Gains in Vegetated Classes (Excluding Aquatic Beds) from the 1950s to 1989 in the Galveston Bay System
- 4-9 Comparing Areas of Emergent and Forest/Scrub Shrub Wetlands for the 1950s, 1979, and 1989 in the Galveston Bay System
- 4-10 Overall Trend in USACE Permit Activity for Galveston Bay